

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,383	12/28/1999	DOMINIC J. MOREA	06920-0120	9919
7	590 08/08/2002	•		
	ANNING & MARTIN	EXAMINER		
INTELLECUAL PROPERTY 1600 ATLANTA FINANCIAL CENTER			O'CONNOR, GERALD J	
	REE ROAD, N.E. A 30326-1044		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	
			DATE MAILED: 08/08/2002	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/473,383

Applicant(s)

Morea et al.

Examiner

O'Connor

Art Unit **3627**



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period 1	for Reply	
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE <u>three</u> MONTH(S) FROM
- Extens		no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
- If the p - If NO p - Failure - Any re	period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within th	nd will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	,	
1) 🗆	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b) 💢 This action	on is non-final.
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance e closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pair	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is the Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposi	tion of Claims	
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-25</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4	la) Of the above, claim(s) <u>none</u>	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-25</u>	is/are rejected.
7) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) 🗌	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	ation Papers	
9) 💢	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)💢	The drawing(s) filed on Dec 28, 1999 is/are	a) \bigcirc accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply t	o this Office action.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13) 🗌	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) [☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:	
	1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been received.
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received in Application No
	application from the International Burea	
*S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	e certified copies not received.
14) 🗌	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
_	The translation of the foreign language provisiona	
15)∐	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachm		
	otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
7	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3, ini	omidion pisclosure statement(s) (F10-1445) Paper No(s),	6) Other:

Application: 09/473,383 Page 2

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the full extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

The following error is noted:

• On page 41, line 9: "account may" should be --to--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 16, 21, and 25 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

The test as to whether a claim is a proper dependent claim is that it shall include every limitation of the claim from which it depends (35 U.S.C. 112, fourth paragraph), or, in other words, that it shall not conceivably be infringed by anything which would not also infringe the basic claim.

When, as here, an independent claim recites a particular method, a dependent claim drawn to an apparatus capable of performing the method of the independent claim is not a proper dependent claim if the apparatus might be used in other ways, since the dependent claim (the

Application: 09/473,383 Page 3

Art Unit: 3627

apparatus) could conceivably be infringed without infringing the basic claim (the method), in violation of the infringement test for proper dependency of claims. See MPEP § 608.01(n)(III).

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- 4. Claims 16, 21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Zirkel (US 6,135,349).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application: 09/473,383 Page 4

Art Unit: 3627

6. Claims 1-15, 17-20, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, as described in the written specification, in view of Zirkel (US 6,135,349).

As described by applicant, the essence of the instant invention is a method of using the Internet, by means of appropriate computer hardware and software, to perform an otherwise conventional, well known method for activating a merchant account, accomplishing the same result as had heretofore been accomplished via manual means.

However, Zirkel discloses a similar method of activating a merchant account, and the method of Zirkel indeed includes activating the merchant account by means of the Internet, using appropriate computer hardware and software.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the conventional manual method of activating a merchant account described by applicant, so as to allow a merchant to activate a merchant account by means of the Internet, using appropriate computer hardware and software, in accordance with the teachings of Zirkel, in order to improve the efficiency of the merchant account application/ordering process, by having the merchant input all of the required application information, thereby saving time by reducing the amount of manual effort required on the part of the account provider, and also allowing the merchant to apply at any time convenient for the merchant, independent of the hours of the account provider, thereby increasing sales/profits for the account provider.

Application: 09/473,383

Art Unit: 3627

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication, or earlier communications, should be directed to the examiner, Jerry O'Connor, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1525, and whose facsimile number is (703) 746-3976.

GJOC

July 31, 2002

Gerald J. O'Connor

Page 5

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unit 3627